

Report on the 3rd International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation

Overview

The 3rd International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation (ICLDC) (<http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/ICLDC/2013/>) was held in Honolulu from February 28-March 3 this year. The theme of the 3rd ICLDC was “Sharing Worlds of Knowledge,” with the aim to build on the strong momentum created at the 1st and 2nd ICLDCs (<http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/ICLDC/2009/>, <http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/ICLDC/2011/>) and to highlight the interdisciplinary nature of language documentation and the many kinds of human knowledge that language workers are likely to encounter. In response to requests from attendees of the previous two conferences, this year’s conference was a full day longer than in 2009 and 2011.

Conference planning and organization

Conference planning began in the fall of 2011 and was led by the following committee:

Andrea L. Berez, Co-chair (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Victoria Anderson, Co-chair (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Jim Yoshioka, Coordinator (NFLRC, UH Mānoa)
Kenneth L. Rehg (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
James Dean Brown (NFLRC, UH Mānoa)
Lyle Campbell (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Larry Kimura (Hawaiian Studies, UH Hilo)
Yuko Otsuka (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Nick Thieberger (Linguistics, University of Melbourne)

Conference organization involved a 15-member Student Steering Committee.

Erenst Anip (Library Services, UH Mānoa)
Tobias Bloyd (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Katie Butler (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Becki Clifford (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Jay Hatfield (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
David Iannucci (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Stephanie Locke (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Chris Mann (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Colleen O'Brien (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)

Emerson Lopez Odango (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Mayumi Oiwa (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Eve Okura (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Colleen Patton (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Melody Ann Ross (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)
Sean Simpson (Linguistics, UH Mānoa)

Andrea Berez taught a seminar “Professional Development in Linguistics” in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 with the assistance of Victoria Anderson and Jim Yoshioka to provide the students with hands-on training in conference organization.

We also took advantage of the social media sites Facebook and Twitter to keep in touch with interested parties. The Facebook page (<http://www.facebook.com/icldc>) and the Twitter account (http://twitter.com/ICLDC_HI) were launched in October 2011 and lasted through the conference. Posts included the calls for volunteers, reminders about conferences deadlines (e.g., pre-registration), and facts about language documentation and conservation. Currently, the two sites continue to serve as a way to inform conference fans of important resources and opportunities related to language documentation and conservation as well as news of the 4th ICLDC Conference planned for 2015.

Sponsors

The 3rd ICLDC received generous support from the following agencies. Key among these sponsors, the NFLRC provided not only financial assistance but also critical technical and organizational support. NFLRC Program Coordinator Jim Yoshioka provided invaluable logistical support for all aspects of conference implementation before, during, and after the event.

National Science Foundation (NSF)
UH Department of Linguistics
UH National Foreign Language Resource Center (NFLRC)
UH College of Languages, Linguistics, & Literature (LLL)
UH Mānoa Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education (OFCRGE)
UH Endowment for the Humanities
UH Dai Ho Chun Endowment
Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani College of Hawaiian Language (UH Hilo campus)
Nāwahīokalani'ōpu'u Hawaiian Medium School
'Aha Pūnana Leo
'Imiloa Astronomy Center of Hawai'i

Outcomes

The 3rd ICLDC exceeded ICLDC 1 (2009) and ICLDC 2 (2011) in sheer numbers and ambition. The number of participants increased by 13% from last time, with a record-breaking 439 people attending the conference. Attendees included university faculty, students, speaker community members, researchers, and independent scholars from 25 different countries/territories: Australia, Austria, Canada, China, the Federated States of Micronesia, France, Germany, Greenland, Guam, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, South Korea, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Taiwan, Trinidad & Tobago, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

We received 282 abstract submissions (a 12% increase from last time). Our Advisory Committee, consisting of 34 recognized experts in the field from Australia, Canada, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, the US, and the UK, together with graduate linguistics students from UH, anonymously reviewed and accepted 133 papers originally (for a 47% acceptance rate), resulting in a program with up to six parallel paper sessions, 30 poster presentations, and 20 electronic poster sessions (a new presentation feature added with ICLDC 3). Selected papers are being solicited for the NFLRC-sponsored online journal *Language Documentation & Conservation*, and audio recordings/materials of the presentations are archived and made publicly available in the ICLDC community in ScholarSpace:
<https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/26591>

Conference highlights

In addition to some 100+ presentations, two plenaries, two poster sessions, and one electronic poster session, the 3rd ICLDC offered a variety of additional special events before, during, and after the conference. The full program, including schedule and abstracts, can be seen here:
<http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/ICLDC/2013/program.html>.

Pre- and post-conference talks:

Two free public talks, sponsored in part by the Dai Ho Chun Endowment, were given on February 27 and March 4, the days immediately preceding and following the 3rd ICLDC. Dr. Linda Barwick (University of Sydney) spoke about cultural diversity in the temporal arts, especially with regard to ethnomusicology and language documentation in Australia. Dr. David Mark (State University of New York at Buffalo) spoke about the documentation of landscape features (“ethnophysiogeography”) in indigenous languages, especially in Australia and Native North America.

Pre-conference Film Screenings:

The evening before the start of the conference featured two film screenings. Each of these films was the topic of a presentation during the ICLDC, and the producer/directors were on hand to answer questions after the screening. Approximately 80 people attended. The films are described below.

Silvestre Pantaleón, produced and co-directed by Jonathan D. Amith, is a luminescent study of the last man of his village still versed in traditional rope making and other disappearing crafts. The protagonist lives in San Agustín Oapan, a Nahuatl speaking village in central Guerrero, Mexico. Looking for relief from pain and numbness, he visits a card reader and is told that to be cured offerings must be made to the dead, the hearth, the ants, and the river. The film delicately follows Silvestre as he makes rope to raise the money necessary for the ceremony *Levantamiento de sombra* ('lifting of the shadow'). *Silvestre Pantaleón* provides an intensely personal portrait of a man facing, in a unique setting, the universal process of aging.

M!a m gu tju, 'we build a house' is a short amateur documentary film by the San hunter-gatherers of the Kalahari and a Ph.D student, Lee Pratchett. It aims to show the facility with which culturally-sensitive visual stimuli for language documentation can arise from cultural documentation, yielding richer and fuller results for the community and the researcher.

Plenary talks:

There were two conference plenaries, both of which were well received by the audience.

Nicholas Evans (Australian National University) gave a plenary called "The web of words and the web of life," which talked about the linguistic encoding of knowledge about biological diversity, drawing on examples from his fieldwork in Australia and Papua New Guinea. Travel arrangements for Dr. Evans were generously sponsored by a generous grant from the UH Endowment for the Humanities.

Kālepa Baybayan (Polynesian Voyaging Society) discussed the history of deep-sea voyaging, exploration, and oceanic wayfinding, and the indigenous system of orientation and navigation at sea, and the efforts to use these experiences to revitalize a once dynamic maritime culture by educating through a native world view that begins with learning through the language of the host culture while steering connections through an experience that explains the symbiotic relationship between land, sea, sky, science, and culture.

Master Classes:

In accordance with the conference theme "Sharing Worlds of Knowledge," the 3rd ICLDC featured three afternoons of Master Classes in topics outside of linguistics that documenters are likely to encounter in their work. The Master Classes were sponsored by NSF. Master Classes were taught in the following topics by the following experts:

- Linda Barwick (University of Sydney): Documenting Ethnomusicology
- Alex Golub (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa): Documenting Kinship Systems
- David Mark (University at Buffalo): Ethnophysiogeography: Documenting Categories of Landscape Features
- Will McClatchey (Botanical Research Institute of Texas): Folk Taxonomy
- Warren Nishimoto (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa): Documenting Oral History
- Tamara Ticktin (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa): Ethnobotany

American Sign Language and International Sign Interpretation:

Generous support from the UH Mānoa College of LLL and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education (OFCRGE) made it possible for the ICLDC to provide sign language interpretation to conference participants for the first time. A team of professional interpreters was on duty throughout the conference, including its evening receptions, to translate between spoken English, American Sign Language, and International Sign, as necessary for both audience and presenters. On the last day of the conference a group of talks focused on endangered sign languages, and the accessibility of the talks to both signers and spoken language users was rewarding for all concerned. The success of this first effort to bring the signed modality of language into the ICLDC has created impetus for further inclusion of signed languages and their users at upcoming ICLDCs.

Office hours:

The following institutions and/or programs held office hours during the conference to provide the conference participants with an opportunity to meet their directors/editors and ask questions: National Science Foundation, Endangered Language Catalog (EL-Cat) project, School of Oriental and African Studies Endangered Language Documentation Programme, UHM Department of Linguistics, and *Language Documentation & Conservation* Journal.

Evening receptions:

Two evening receptions provided a wonderful opportunity for the conference participants to network as well as enjoy a taiko performance on the first night and Hawaiian music on the second.

Recovering Voices Update and Exhibition Development: A Working Session

On the afternoon of the fourth day of the main conference, immediately after the closing ceremony, there was a discussion session organized by the members of the core team of Recovering Voices, an initiative of the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History, National Museum of the American Indian, and the Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, where they presented initial plans and solicited feedback for the exhibition.

Hilo Field Study:

Following the very successful field trips in Hilo at the 1st and 2nd ICLDCs, UH Hilo offered another optional field study on Hawaiian language revitalization in Hilo on March 4-5, immediately following the main conference. This field study, *He ‘Olelo Ola, A Living Hawaiian Language: Our Language Binds Us To Our Culture*, was organized by Nāwahīokalani‘ōpu‘u Hawaiian Medium School, ‘Aha Pūnana Leo, ‘Imiloa Astronomy Center of Hawai‘i, and Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani College of Hawaiian Language University of Hawai‘i at Hilo, Hawai‘i.

Languages discussed at the conference

’Olekha, Amdo, Anii, Athabascan, Baure, Besemah Malay, Blackfoot, Bubbure, Channel Islands Language, Cherokee, Chimane, Chinantec, Chuukese, Chuvash, Coeur d’Alene, Cook Islands Māori, Dalabon, Dena’ina, Desano, Dzongkha, Faetar, Gamilaraay, Gújjolaay-Eegimaa, Hawaiian, Hua, Ifiallig, Igbo, Ikema Ryukyuan, Indonesian Languages, Itelmen, Jul’hoan, Kalaallisut, Kanakanavu, Kapampangan, Khoesan Languages, Kubeo, Kula, Kun-borrk, Kwak’wala, Lenape, Light Warlpiri, Listuguj Mi’gmaq, Luiseño, Mackenzie Basin Dene, Māori, Mi’gmaq, Micha, Mitchif, Mixean, Mortlockese, Mufian, Mushungulu, N’kep, Navajo, Northern Paiute, Nxa’amxcín, Oceanic Languages, Old Hawai‘i Sign Language, Papua New Guinean Languages, Pisamira, Pomo, Qaqet, Saaroa, Salishan Languages, Scottish Gaelic, Secwepemc, SENĆOTEN, Serrano, Sign Languages, Siraya, Solega, Tetlin, Thong Boi, Tibeto-Burman Languages, Tlingit, Tok Pisin, Torwali, Trinidad and Tobagoan Languages, Trung, Tsakhur, Tunica, Tuscarora, Upper Tanana, Wapichana, Wappo, Washo, Yakkha, Yurok, Yurutí, Zapotec.

A summary of comments from the evaluation form

Feedback from participants has been overwhelmingly extremely positive. Below is a summary of the responses provided in the 87 evaluation forms that were returned. In particular, the conference organizing team received high praise for the conference website, timely email communication, smooth registration process and reasonable fees, conference program packet, helpfulness of staff, tech support, conference venue, schedule, presentation topics, plenaries, paper sessions, and social events. As one attendee summarized, “Keep up the great work! This has been a very successful conference. Mahalo”

Pre-conference publicity, communication, registration

	Strongly disagree	disagree	agree	strongly agree	n/a
Conference publicity was good.	0	3	40	42	3
Response to email was timely.	1	0	16	56	1
The registration fee was reasonable.	0	4	16	56	17
The conference website was informative and helpful.	0	1	30	58	1

Proposal submission procedures

	strongly disagree	disagree	agree	strongly agree
The online proposal submission system was easy and convenient to use.	0	0	25	33
The proposal deadline was reasonable.	0	1	26	32
My proposal was judged in a timely manner.	0	0	24	35
I was generally satisfied with the proposal submission process.	2	0	23	35
The proposal submission guidelines were clear.	0	0	23	35

Conference organization

	poor	fair	good	excellent	n/a
Registration process	0	2	25	60	1
Conference packet	0	5	27	54	0
Helpfulness of staff	0	0	14	71	3
Tech support & equipment	0	1	24	47	0
Conference facilities	0	2	26	64	0
Boxed lunch	2	6	25	26	31
Coffee/tea service	3	7	33	41	5
Transportation	3	5	26	15	40
Conference dates	2	5	47	32	1
Conference length (expanded to 4 days)	1	5	42	42	0
Program schedule	0	2	33	52	1
Accommodation (availability / convenience)	1	17	28	30	26
Accommodation (cost)	4	14	31	30	22
Topics	1	3	28	56	0

Conference events

	poor	fair	good	excellent	n/a
Plenary talks	1	2	29	47	5
Master Classes (new this time)	1	7	30	40	11
Paper sessions	1	3	31	53	2
Poster sessions	0	3	38	30	6
Electronic poster sessions (new this time)	0	7	21	17	39
Social events onsite (receptions)	0	0	30	49	7
Social events offsite (graduate student mixer)	0	3	11	8	61

I. Why did you decide to attend ICLDC? (“Other” comments)

- Research ideas
- Desire to share w/others working in field
- Network and meet others in the field
- Prospective student at U Hawaii
- To meet people
- Chance for my colleague to be involved
- Link with Hawaiian immersion tour
- Other meetings scheduled to coincide

II. Pre-conference publicity, communication, registration

- It is very nice to have the date and rough schedule as early as possible in order to secure funds and make cheaper travel arrangements.
- Would have been nice if program had been online (clickable) rather than one big PDF.
- There was one problem – a couple events scheduled by others to coincide with the conference were announced after I booked my flights. Such meetings should be announced well in advance.
- Excellent value for the money! Terrific food!
- The registration option for students was excellent. Thank you for making this reasonable for us!
- I like that conference fee wasn't inflated with cost of lunches/drinks at social events.
- Registration fee a bit high for under-employed people, third-world visitors
- A wonderful & fantastic experience.
- Jim (Yoshioka) was amazing!
- Yes, there are ASL interpreters - beautiful jobs.

III. Proposal submission procedures

- This aspect of the organization was exceptional.
- I submitted from West Africa and it worked surprisingly well.
- I would have liked the deadline to be in September rather than August.
- Would appreciate feedback on rejection.

IV. Conference organization

Overall

- Excellent. One of the best conferences I've ever been to, organizationally. Flawless!

Registration process

- Early registration the day before would ease the rush on the first morning.
- Signage of where to go on Day 1 was poor (e.g., no signs for early coffee or signs for 1st session room).

Conference packet

- Conf. packet: Should have included 1-2 sheets of blank papers.
- Fonts used on name tags are too small to read from a common social distance. Please make first name larger if not the entire name.

Moderators

- Yes, but moderator didn't show up for my session
- Moderators did not always keep time. For example, I was started 15 min too early b/c the moderator didn't realize there were 10 minute breaks. Also, staff/volunteers were excellent, but the students seemed a little run down since they also had classes. Maybe cancel class??

Tech equipment & support

- Twice observed speakers struggling with tech and in one case the yellow shirt assistant was not helpful.
- Need staff for Keoni Auditorium sound booth. Imin staff were sleeping on the job. Tech staff need training in set-up of projectors and Macbooks as well. Conference dates conflict with classes. Make conference length more compact. A few timeslots conflicted in theme.

Conference facilities

- Some rooms were small and very warm.
- Koi Room has very poor acoustics - we shouldn't have to use a union hall voice for academic presentations.
- Elevator sucks
- If ICLDC continues to grow a larger venue is needed.
- If the numbers are expected to continue to expand, will need to consider how to house so many - we have already overstretched space for both plenary & eating. Breaks between sessions appreciated.

Boxed lunch

- It would be good to have more non-western contexts in the presentations. A light lunch option of salads or wraps would have been nice.
- Boxed lunch: didn't order it because I thought it would be sandwiches and I can't eat bread or any other grains and that seemed too complicated to report. Perhaps some indication of the type of meal would help. (I mean an indication that it's not just a sandwich)
- I heard 3 others that did not like the spam in the lunch.
- Boxed lunches needed knives. Master Classes were a great idea, but breaks should have been enforced. Or put master classes at beginning of day.

Coffee/tea service

- Very good coffee/snack service
- The coffee and tea were great except for the last day. That's actually the day when it needed to be beefed up a little ... less options on campus and no scheduled time for lunch before the closing.
- Ongoing coffee/tea service is great.
- Real milk!
- I may be the only one, but I would have liked a decaf coffee option.
- There are at least 3 delegates who are gluten free - it would be nice to have some gluten-free cakes, etc.
- More gluten-free options would be great!
- A small detail: Water was plentiful but perhaps the set up could be adjusted so the cup could be set on something while filling.

Transportation

- Busses from hotels should have come a bit later in the morning. More hotel options would have helped.
- Would like to have earlier times to return to hotel, 5:00 or so.
- Getting from the airport to campus was a bit of an affair. I would recommend a taxi and not a shuttle; they did not know the campus at all.

Conference dates/length

- Having it right in the middle of the semester is difficult.
- Dates are in the middle of our teaching term which makes it hard to come and makes it almost impossible to come for 4 days. However, that being said, it is obviously impossible to pick a time that works for everyone.
- 4 days is excellent for getting more people here, but a little exhausting. Really appreciated that it was less show-and-telling than the last iteration.
- 12 hour days are too much, especially with a 4th day added. It's really challenging for those of us staying in Waikiki. If you keep the 4th day, I suggest a mid-day bus transport option so people can pace themselves throughout the event.

Program schedule

- Program schedule: At times, conflict between several interesting parallel talks; at other times, no interesting parallel talks (for me). Need longer break before master classes.
- 30 minutes per session is a bit short. Adding another 20 or 30 minutes would allow enough time for Q&A's, I think.
- If the lunch time can always be at least one and half hour, it will be better.
- 1/2 hour is such a short block for papers - wish we could have 45 minutes

Accommodations

- On-campus accommodations was excellent. Felt the fourth day was almost too much.
- Accommodations: Good that there was an inexpensive option (E-W Center). Ohana hotels were very convenient but the rooms were a bit dingy – not enough value for the high cost.
- I didn't know about Lincoln Hall and can't afford Ohana.
- Lodging fair in terms of condition; excellent in terms of availability & location (Ohana West)

Topics

- Future topics can include more direct connections to pedagogy and language learning, to better facilitate interdisciplinary solutions for enhancing intergenerational transmission.
- Topics: Offer more on theory of documentation and revitalization and on evaluation of revitalization efforts. Good idea to offer Master Classes.

V. Conference events

Plenary talks

- Really enjoyed Nick's plenary. Paper sessions - varying degrees of quality; some had absolutely no theoretical/conceptual grounding; others were outstanding. Better vetting and/or clearer submission criteria might improve overall quality. Social events - thanks! They were really nice/fun.
- Would be nice to have more plenary talks, at least one plenary talk each day

Regular presentation sessions

- As always, quality of talks varied, but I thought it was good overall.

Master Classes

- Master class idea was very cool. The better ones engaged the participants with activities. More group projects in these would be good.
- The Ethnomusicology and Ethnobotany workshops were excellent though I heard that some of the others weren't as smooth.
- I loved the presentations; the presenters were very engaging. The master classes as well. I could not have gotten through those long sessions if they hadn't been so enthusiastic!
- The master classes were offered at a time of day when jet lag and lots of sessions made me too tired to attend. Maybe offer some options at the beginning of the day?
- Master classes - 2 hours max. (just too long. also, tell the presenters to give us a 10-minute break in the middle).
- Master classes - interesting. Rather long at this time of day.
- Future master class topics could include: Language policy & planning, Bi/multilingual education, ethnographic methods, qualitative interview/discourse analysis

Poster Sessions/e-Poster session

- Posters every lunch period, when there's only an hour for lunch, is too much. One lunch time only, or better yet, give them a time slot and do all at once.
- Posters & eposters well attended - would have liked having a presenter at each poster to talk to. Eposter a cool idea - was a bit difficult to see who/which project was where in the room.
- Electronic posters - they needed signs or something so you could find them.
- Liked the electronic posters, make that available to all who submit.
- I liked the eposter session as a presenter.

Receptions

- 2 evening receptions very good for meeting people (having a good meal!)
- Receptions were great and a good conversation opportunity.
- The food and entertainment at the receptions was great!
- Music a bit too loud for conversation on first night
- Loved the music, but Sat evening, no microphones & wind blew the sound away
- Need more time to meet and discuss. Good food & entertainment.

Grad student mixer

- The student mixer was an excellent idea but the bar was a bit too noisy & I quickly lost track of the other students in the crowd.
- Next time tell people if the club for the mixer has no sign!
- Venue of the student mixer was a bit too loud and night club-like for mixing.

General

- Given the theme of this year's conference I was surprised by the low representation of community members. Many of the talks were also surprisingly technical (in a linguistic sense, not technological).
- Sadly I simply ran out of time to see most of these, perhaps because I was presenting and moderating. Also I attended every paper/master class session.
- Good – I wish it were easier to get between the hotel and the conference site. Also, info on public transportation would have been nice...
- Having the 10 minute break between each talk was a GREAT IDEA!

VI. Future planning

1. Which aspects of the conference did you find most useful and/or enjoyable? Why?

Overall

- Everything! Thoroughly enjoyed the whole experience.
- All aspects of the conference were very enjoyable. This was my first time attending, and my daughter was amazed to see and hear the many languages. A wonderful experience for us both.

Theme / interdisciplinary nature of conference

- I got to expose myself to many interdisciplinary fields related to linguistics, which helped broaden my scope and introduce me to new ways of acquiring indigenous/local knowledge
- Exposure to the perspectives from different locations around the world and the developing understanding of a diversity of practitioners.
- The people - having funding for (more) community members to be there is/would be great - love all the diverse viewpoints/topics, learned a lot.
- I especially enjoyed the co-mingling of people with different perspectives; native speakers, language learners, researchers; linguists, anthropologists, activists, biologists, botanists, etc.; Native American language groups, Australian language groups, Austronesian, Asian, etc. Seeing things from other perspectives gives me a chance to be inspired to do new things with my research.
- Almost too many choices! Great interdisciplinarity, great linguistics.
- I loved it all. So fun to choose which talks to go to. I really appreciated the focus on interdisciplinary topics - particularly those involving astronomy.
- Theme of “sharing worlds of knowledge” - interdisciplinary collaborations.

Plenaries & Master Classes

- Nick Evans' plenary was great.
- Master Classes – Best presentations, best speakers, topics that help other fields. Having coffee area for the whole time to help bridge any problems.
- The master classes were a great idea. With a longer (4 day) schedule & repeating in the future, maybe there could be multiple sessions, i.e., part I, II, III?
- The talks were great. The setting is beautiful, and the staff is so helpful.

Food & social activities / networking

- Conference layout/rooms (incl. poster/coffee area) were excellent.
- Tea room & 10-min break is fantastic! for networking
- Networking, socializing, updates on projects and critical evaluations of the notion “collaboration”.
- Networking. Meeting & talking with people.

- Besides the very informative talks, I found the social activities most useful in generating possible collaborations for future projects. This was one of the best run conferences I've ever been to!
- Location (HI) seems central to many nations and thus enjoyed meeting colleagues from countries other than USA.

Paper & poster presentations

- Papers were almost all very very high quality.
- Papers that addressed practical aspects of documentation from a field worker and/or community perspective
- The papers were excellent this year – really thought-provoking!
- Talks were, on the whole, excellent.
- All the talks & classes were fantastic. Posters were great - nice that they were in the main room. Food was good and plentiful. Topics and organization was fantastic.
- I love the size - big enough for a variety of topics, small enough for a feeling of community. Evening events were great! For the most part, the quality of the presentations was quite good.
- Deaf participation. Learning linguistics, various topics

2. Were you able to attend all parts of the conference that you wanted to?

- Yes - 32
- Missed a Master Class I'd've liked to attend.
- Yes, although concurrent sessions did force some decisions
- Yes. A couple of paper clashes but that's inevitable.
- For the most part. - 2
- Most parts. - 2
- Some desirable talks were same time in different rooms. Timing between talks was well planned, making changing rooms easy.
- Too many great talks! Didn't make all of them but I hope the recordings will be made available.
- There were occasionally competing talks, but I love that you're recording everything so I can catch them later. Thanks!
- There were some paper sessions that clashed but that is always inevitable at conferences.
- I've attended in years past. Thought the schedule this year was more thematic and had fewer "direct conflicts" > talks that seemed the same topic/theme scheduled against each other.
- I wish I had spent more time w/the posters
- No - embarrassment of riches!
- No, as always, there were lots of papers schedule at the same time. But given the amount of papers, I was happy with the schedule.

3. What would you like to see included or changed at future ICLDC conferences?

Overall

- You are doing a fantastic job.
- You're all doing a wonderful job. Thank you!!
- Fantastic conference. None. (It was cold inside!)
- I'm not sure! I'm totally new to this. I'm very content with it.
- Volunteers - amazing job done! Helpful & very interactive.
- Can't think of a thing. Mahalo to you all!! :-)
- Mahalo for your excellent conference!
- Keep up the great work! This has been a very successful conference. Mahalo

More language representation and language revitalization

- More native speakers please!
- A special stream for people working on reviving “sleeping” languages
- More languages in a non-western context and those that are threatened.
- More inclusion of the cultural and spiritual aspects of language.
- More community involvement to hear their views on the support for researchers, linguistics, etc. Linguists spoke their work; it would be lovely to hear the other side and to hear people's thoughts & views of working with linguists. Mix it & spread it over time.
- It would be great if there were more papers/posters that focused on languages outside of the Pacific and Americas (e.g., Africa, mainland Asia)
- Perhaps more explicit tracking of themes in each room so that those of us interested in certain themes don't need to change rooms quite so often.
- More of a focus on language revitalization. More language speakers. Better descriptions of presentations. I thought some were misleading, and I was disappointed with the “actual” presentation only because it was not what was described. Thanks. :)
- The explicit inclusion of revitalization would be useful as the assumption that documentation + conservation = revitalization is not shared by most revitalizers. However, the fields will always have a close connection and revitalizers are not catered to elsewhere.

Presentation suggestions

- I think the Master Classes were a good idea, but I think the fact that the ethnobotany class had both an ethnobotanist and a linguist involved was very good. Also it involved a practical element. The others were good but perhaps because they had time, a little slow getting going. And perhaps more practical application would be good. Plus a recognition of factors from across the board, a linguist's involvement in preparation could be good.
- “Master classes” can be included in the future conferences.
- Paper sessions could be longer: 30-45 minute presentations with 10 mins for Q&A. Shorter time (5 mins) to get from class to class.
- Signs/labels for the electronic posters.
- More sign language but not ones by hearing people

- I would like to see more deaf participants.

Food/social suggestions

- Very nice to have drinks and snacks available all day given all the diff. times zones people are visiting from.
- Optional evening activities? Group/birds of a feather dinners?
- Visit to schools in Honolulu during main conference, for those unable to visit Hilo
- I talked w/someone else here about including yoga or other exercise classes at conferences - it's a lot of sitting for days on end! It'd be good to get some serious stretching in. Or maybe a hike...

Funding suggestions

- More affordable - fewer 'frills'? More communication & advice, re: Hilo trip.
- Perhaps add a small donation option to registration fee so those w/means can finance more travel money for indigenous language speakers, who were present but less represented at this ICLDC than the past two.